

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on February 23, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully considered. A Petition for Three-Month Extension of Time, an Affidavit under 37 C.F.R. §1.132, and a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.114 are submitted herewith.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended editorially without change in scope, and claims 11-14 are added. Claims 1, 11 and 13 are independent. Reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks, respectfully is requested. Additionally, Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Aashish R. Karkhanis, by Examiner Boehler during the telephone interview conducted on May 21, 2010. Applicants' separate record of the interview is incorporated into the remarks below.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0035310 to *Tsuboi et al.* (hereinafter "*Tsuboi*") in view of JP 2003-013989 to *Yutaka* (hereinafter "*Yutaka*"). This rejection respectfully is traversed.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, that the power transmission faces of the engagement arms include power transmission faces that each have a first interference fit, and power transmission faces that each have a second interference fit, the second interference fit being smaller than the first interference fit. Here, a

larger numerical value for the first interference fit is intentionally set in view of such factors as creep, wear, and noise reduction during a design phase. It is known in the art that an interference fit is set to a dimension much greater than manufacturing tolerance variations in machined parts. As noted in the attached Declaration, an exemplary first interference fit d1 of 0.675 mm and an exemplary second interference fit d2 of 0.175 mm are an order of magnitude larger than the machining tolerance of ± 0.05 mm. Therefore, *Tsuboi* fails to teach or to suggest that the power transmission faces of the engagement arms include power transmission faces each having a first interference fit and power transmission faces each having a second interference fit, the second interference fit being smaller than the first interference fit, as recited in claim 1. *Yukata* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Tsuboi* discussed above.

The Examiner has rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tsuboi*, in view of *Yutaka* and U.S. Patent No. 2,135,634 to *Byrom* (hereinafter “*Byrom*”). However, *Byrom* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Tsuboi* and *Yukata* discussed above.

In view of the above, no permissible combination of the applied references can reasonably be considered to teach or to suggest the combination of all of the features recited in claim 1. Claims 2-10 are also allowable, at least for their dependence on allowable claim 1 as discussed above, as well as for the

separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites. Claims 11-14 are also patentable for the reasons given below.

New claim 11 recites an electric power steering device that comprises, among other features, a power transmission joint including an elastic member that has a first face and a second face, and that includes a plurality of engagement arms extending radially from a circumferential surface of the elastic member and increasing in width from the first face to the second face. During the telephone interview, the Examiner agreed with Applicants' representative that none of the applied references teach or suggest the above noted combination of features. Specifically, *Tsuboi*, *Yukata*, and *Byrom* each fail to teach an increasing width of engagement arms. Dependent claim 12 also is allowable at least for its dependence on claim 11.

New claim 13 recites a power transmission joint with features similar to those of the power transmission joint recited in claim 11, and therefore is likewise patentable over the prior art. Dependent claim 14 is also allowable at least for its dependence on claim 13.

Based on the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice, with allowed claims 1-14, earnestly is solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a further conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

A three-month extension fee is submitted herewith. However, should any additional fee be required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



August 23, 2010
Date

Steven M. Rabin – Reg. No. 29,102
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995
Facsimile: 202-408-0924
Telephone: 202-371-8976

SMR/ARK/pq